DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 834 RE 002 300

AUTHOR Gcld, Lawrence
TITLE Evaluation cf the Learning Center by the Cccperating School Districts.
INSTITUTICN Iearning Center, Binghamton, N.Y.
Pub Date 1 Oct 68
Ncte 34p.

EDRS Price EIRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.80
Descriptors *Dyslexia, Federal Prcgrams, Interinstitutional Cooperaticn, Learning Disabilities, *Program Evaluation, *Reading Centers, Reading Diagncsis, Remedial Reading Clinics, *Supplementary Educaticnal Centers, Tutorial Prcgrams, Underachievers

Abstract

An evaluaticn was made cf the Iearning Center, an ESEA/Title III-funded PACE (Projects to Advance Creativity in Educaticn) prcject designed tc develcp a diagnostic and tutorial program for severe underachievers, particularly those whc manifest the ccndition cf develcpmental dyslexia. A rating scale and questicnnaire were ccmpleted by the 13 public and one private school districts in New York state that actively participated in the Center's prcgram during the 1967-68 schcol year. Those activities which the Iearning Center stressed during this period were viewed very favcrably by the districts. These activities included the tutcrial program, diagncstic reports, prcgress repcrts, ccnferences spcnscred by the Center, and ccmmunications between the Center and districts. Twenty-six suggestions fcr areas of increased emphasis were made, while 86 percent of the responding districts indicated that nc services should receive decreased emphasis. There was a strong indicatien that the majority of the districts viewed favcrably the general prcgram and objectives of the Center and that they recommended its ccntinuatien after the period cf federal funding. Appended are the questionnaire and summary response tables, a schccl district pcpulatien survey, and a summary cf the original funding proposal. (CM)

ED033834

LEARNING CENTER
58 Oak Street
Binghamton, New York 13905
Telephone: 607-724-2491

RESEARCH REPORT
October 1, 1968

TITLE: Evaluation of the Learning Center by the Cooperating School Districts

PREPARED BY: Lawrence Gold, Director

PRINCIPAL EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT: Rating scale and questionnaire developed by the Learning Center and entitled, "Cooperating School District Program Evaluation, 1967-1968."

PERIOD UNDER EVALUATION: September, 1967 - June, 1968

* * * * * * * * *

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RE002 300

THIS IS A SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTER SUPPORTED BY THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION (TITLE III, ESEA) AND SPONSORED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN BROOME AND TIOGA COUNTIES.

INTRODUCTION

The Learning Center was established under Title III authorization of the Elementary and Secondary School Education Act of 1965, upon application of nineteen public and private school districts in Broome and part of Tioga counties on the Southern Tier of New York State. The Center is one of many PACE (Projects to Advance Creativity in Education) programs which have been developed across the nation to (1) provide services unavailable to children, (2) raise the quality of services already offered, and (3) stimulate experimental educational projects which may serve as models for regular school programs.

The application submitted by the local school districts and authorized for funding by the U.S. Office of Education specified the formation of a Learning Center whose primary goal would be the development of a diagnostic and tutorial program for severe underachievers, particularly those who manifest the condition of developmental dyslexia. In addition to the diagnostic and tutorial services the Center provides a professional development program for teachers, maintains a professional library and instructional materials center, and performs research and demonstration activities.

The present report covers the period from September, 1967 through June, 1968. Although the Center was authorized to begin operations in June,

1966, it was not until March, 1967 that pupils were involved in the clinical program on a pilot basis. The program did not become fully operational until September, 1967.

The director of the Center invited the School District Representatives to a meeting held May 29, 1968. The evaluative instrument (herein attached as Appendix I) was distributed to the representatives and procedures for its completion were reviewed. It was recommended that the completion of the instrument reflect a consensus of opinion among the professional staff in each school district.

The completed evaluative instruments were received by the Learning Center in June and July of 1968. All fourteen districts who actively participated in the program during the year 1967-68 responded. The combined pupil population of these districts (thirteen public and one private) comprise 95.0% of the total eligible pupil population which the Center may serve in the bi-county area (see Appendix III for the names and pupil populations of the school districts and their participation status for the school year 1967-68).

RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

The discussion which follows is based upon the tabulations which appear in the "Summary of Cooperating School District Program Evaluations" (attached herein as Appendix II). The Summary itself follows closely

the format presented in the evaluative instrument (Appendix I). Both documents should be referred to for further clarification of statements made in this report.

I. Clinical Services

Eleven of the fourteen districts participated in this phase of the program of the Center. Each district was requested to rate ten categories (A. through J. of the evaluative instrument) using the following key:

5 - no opinion
4 - excellent
3 - good
2 - adequate
1 - poor .

The mean ratings given by the school districts appear in the Summary provided in Appendix II. The range of mean ratings was from 1.1 (just above "poor") to 4.0 ("excellent"). The mean of all eleven districts was 2.9, just below "good".

II. Related Services

All fourteen districts evaluated the three categories under Related Services. The range of mean ratings was from 2.0 ("adequate") to 4.0 ("excellent"). The mean of all district ratings was 3.4, midway between "good" and "excellent."

III. Item Analysis of Categories Under Clinical Services

An item analysis of responses to categories under clinical services appears

in pages three through five. Those categories which received "Favorable Responses" of 70% or more include the tutorial program (70%), diagnostic reports (72.7%), and progress reports (72.7%). During the year under evaluation it was these three aspects of the program which received the most emphasis from the staff of the Learning Center.

In computing the "% of Favorable Responses" only ratings of 3 ("good") and 4 ("excellent") were summated. It should also be noted that several categories, such as Medical Evaluations, received a low "% of Favorable Responses" due to insufficient information by the districts (indicated by the ratings of 5 - "no opinion").

IV. Item Analysis of Categories Under Related Services

Analyses of responses to categories under related services appear in pages five and six of the Summary (Appendix II). Categories which received "Favorable Responses" of 70% or more include conferences sponsored by the Learning Center (78.6%) and communications between the Center and the school districts (84.6%).

V. District Recommendations for Changes in Services of the Center

The districts were requested to indicate which aspects of the program should receive increased emphasis or decreased emphasis, and which new services should be offered in the 1968-69 school year. Pages six and seven of the Summary contain the responses.

Twenty-six specific notations for increased emphasis were made. Category I under Clinical Services (visitations by school district staff to the Center) was recommended by four districts and received the highest frequency of recommendations (15.4%). Although visitations by Center staff to the school districts wereamply provided for during the 1967-68 school year, visitations by school district staff to the Center occurred on a relatively limited basis. At least four districts are of the opinion that such visitations would be of value. Other categories which received at least three recommendations for increased emphasis include intensive diagnostic evaluations and medical evaluations.

Relatively few recommendations were made by the districts for services which should receive decreased emphasis. Eleven of the thirteen responses (84.6%) indicated that none of the services provided by the Center should receive reduced emphasis for the 1968-69 school year. It would seem that the cooperating school districts are in substantial agreement that the services provided by the Learning Center are necessary and valid.

Five related comments were made for services not included which should be offered during the 1968-69 school year. These comments appear on page nine of the Summary (Appendix II).

VI. Summary of District Evaluation of the Program of the Learning Center

This section contained five questions which required a response of Yes,

No, or Undecided. The five questions were designed to evaluate the extent to which the districts supported the general program and objectives of the Center.

Pages seven and eight of the Summary contain a tabulation of responses. The majority of the districts (57.2%) indicated that the activities of the Learning Center were in accord with the objectives specified in the original funding proposal (question a.). However, 78.6% of the districts (11 of the 14) indicated that the program of the Learning Center should continue substantially the same for the new academic year (question b.).

To assist the districts in responding to these two questions, a summary of the original funding proposal was provided. This summary was part of the original document and is attached herein as Appendix IV. It should be noted that subsequent budgetary authorization did not permit the development of all the activities indicated in the proposal. The six districts which responded No or Undecided to question a. may not have been aware of this restriction.

Ten of the fourteen districts (71.5%) responded that the Learning Center should continue operations after the period of federal funding. The remaining four districts were "Undecided." No district responded with a categorical "No."

Seven districts (50%) responded that other regions should attempt to

initiate learning centers (question d.) and twelve districts (85.7%) indicated that the Learning Center is a meaningful way to spend federal money specifically earmarked for handicapped children (question e.).

VII. The Extent to Which the Responses Reflect a Consensus Among the Professional Staff

The tabulation on page eight of the Summary indicates that the evaluative instrument was completed with considerable consensus by eight school districts (57.2%), with moderate consensus by three districts (21.4%), and with some consensus by three districts (21.4%).

VIII. Comments by School Districts

Pages nine through eleven contain comments which were offered in connection with the responses to the various parts of the evaluative instrument.

CONCLUSION

The program of the Learning Center during the academic year 1967-68 appears to have been fairly well received by the cooperating school districts. Those activities which the Learning Center stressed during this period were viewed very favorably by the districts. These activities included the tutorial program, the diagnostic reports, the progress reports, conferences sponsored by the Center, and communications between the Center and districts. Recommendations were made by some districts to promote more visitations by the staff of the schools to the Center,

increase the use of medical specialists, and enlarge the scope of services. There is strong indication that the majority of the districts view favorably the concept of a regional Learning Center and would recommend its continuation after the period of federal funding.

APPENDIX I

Cooperating School District Program Evaluation

1967 - 1968

LEARNING CENTER
58 Oak Street
Binghamton, New York 13905
Telephone: 607-724-2491

Cooperating School District Program Evaluation 1967 - 1968

District _____ Date _____

Clinical Services

_____ A. Tutorial Program (for most school districts)
_____ B. Intensive Diagnostic Evaluations (for selected school districts)
_____ C. Diagnostic Reports
_____ D. Progress Reports
_____ E. Psychological Evaluations
_____ F. Medical Evaluations (including neurological)
_____ G. Ophthalmological and Optometric Evaluations
_____ H. Visitations by Center staff to School District Teachers
_____ I. Visitations by School District staff to the Center
_____ J. Conferences Between Parents and Center Teachers
_____ K. Other (specify) _____
_____ L. Other (specify) _____

Related Services

_____ M. Conferences Sponsored by the Learning Center
_____ N. Communications Between the Center and the School Districts
_____ O. Professional Consultations (including meetings) by Staff Members of the Center
_____ P. Other (specify) _____
_____ Q. Other (specify) _____

Note: It is assumed that the following evaluations are based upon some degree of consensus by school district personnel who have had contact with the services of the Learning Center.

I. Kindly use the following numerical rating key (1 through 5) to evaluate each of the above indicated services. It is important that every item (except K, L, P, Q) receive a response.

1 - poor
2 - adequate
3 - good
4 - excellent
5 - no opinion

THIS IS A SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTER SUPPORTED BY THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION (TITLE III, ESEA) AND SPONSORED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN BROOME AND TIOGA COUNTIES.

II. Please answer all of the following questions (you may refer to the services listed above and place the identifying letter(s) in the spaces):

a. Indicate those services which should receive increased emphasis during the 1968-69 school year (if none, so state).

Comment, if any:

b. Indicate those services which should receive decreased emphasis during the 1968-69 school year (if none, so state).

Comment, if any:

c. Indicate services which are not included in the above list and which should be offered by the Learning Center during the 1968-69 school year (if none, so state).

Comment, if any:

III. Please respond to all of the following questions:

IN THE OPINION OF THE COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICT . . . . .

. . . a. do the activities of the Learning Center satisfy the objectives specified in the original funding proposal (see attachment)?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

. . . b. should the program of the Learning Center during the next academic year continue substantially the same as during the present academic year?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

Comment, if any:

. . . c. should the Learning Center attempt to continue operations after the period of federal funding (through June, 1969)?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

Comment, if any:

. . . d. should regions similar to the Broome-Tioga county area attempt to initiate learning centers?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

Comment, if any:

. . . e. is the Learning Center a meaningful way to spend federal money specifically earmarked for handicapped children (recent changes in the Title III act provide that not less than 15% of available funds must go to programs for the handicapped)?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

Comment, if any:

IV. Please make additional comments in this space.

V. Indicate the degree to which the responses on this sheet reflect a consensus among the professional staff in the school district.

The evaluations on this sheet reflect . . . . .

a. _____ some degree of consensus

b. _____ a moderate degree of consensus

c. _____ a considerable degree of consensus.

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX II

Summary of Cooperating School District Program Evaluations

LEARNING CENTER
58 Oak Street
Binghamton, New York 13905
Telephone: 607-724-2491

July 26, 1968

SUMMARY OF

COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICT

PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Program Period

from

July 1, 1967

to

June 30, 1968

* * * * * * * * * *

The data in this summary was prepared from the Cooperating School District Program Evaluation form which each district completed at the request of the Learning Center. The forms were returned during June and July, 1968. Data analysis was provided by Mr. Michael O. Bice, Administrative Assistant.

THIS IS A SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTER SUPPORTED BY THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION (TITLE III, ESEA) AND SPONSORED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN BROOME AND TIOGA COUNTIES.

I. CLINICAL SERVICES

Mean Rating in Descending Order of Acceptance

Rank	District	No. Items	Mean Score
1	Harpursville	6	4.0 -- Excellent
2	Catholic Parochial	4	3.9
3	Chenango Valley	7	3.7
4	Binghamton	6	3.0
4	Chenango Forks	6	3.0
4	Maine-Endwell	9	3.0 -- Good
5	Windsor	7	2.9
6	Johnson City	4	2.8
7	Union-Endicott	4	2.5
8	Vestal	12	2.3 -- Adequate
9	Susquehanna Valley	7	1.1

N=11 Mean of Ratings - 2.9

Key: 4 - excellent
3 - good
2 - adequate
1 - poor

II. RELATED SERVICES

Mean Rating in Descending Order of Acceptance

Rank	District	No. Items	Mean Score
1	Binghamton	2	4.0 -- Excellent
1	Catholic Parochial	4	4.0
1	Deposit	1	4.0
1	Harpursville	3	4.0
1	Johnson City	1	4.0
1	Whitney Point	3	4.0
2	Chenango Forks	3	3.7
2	Maine-Endwell	3	3.7
3	Chenango Valley	3	3.5
3	Windsor	2	3.5 -- Good
4	Susquehanna Valley	3	2.7
4	Union-Endicott	3	2.7
5	Owego-Apalachin	3	2.0 - Adequate
5	Vestal	3	2.0

N = 14 Mean of Ratings - 3.4

Key: 4 - excellent
3 - good
2 - adequate
1 - poor

III. ITEM ANALYSIS OF CATEGORIES UNDER CLINICAL SERVICES

Rating Key: 5 - no opinion
4 - excellent
3 - good
2 - adequate
1 - poor

A. Tutorial Program (10 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	0	0	
4	4	40	
3	3	30	70
2	3	30	
1	0	0	
Total	10	100%	

B. Intensive Diagnostic Evaluations (3 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	0		
4	1	33.3	
3	1	33.3	66.6
2	1	33.3	
1	0		
Total	3	100%	

C. Diagnostic Reports (11 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	0	0	
4	2	18.2	
3	6	54.5	72.7
2	2	18.2	
1	1	9.1	
Total	11	100%	

D. Progress Reports (11 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	0	0	
4	3	27.2	
3	5	45.5	72.7
2	2	18.2	
1	1	9.1	
Total	11	100%	

E. Psychological Evaluations (11 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	3	27.2	
4	2	18.2	
3	4	36.4	54.6
2	1	9.1	
1	1	9.1	
Total	11	100%	

F. Medical Evaluations (9 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	6	66.7	
4	1	11.1	
3	1	11.1	22.2
2	0	0	
1	1	11.1	
Total	9	100%	

G. Ophthalmological and Optometric Evaluations (10 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	7	70	
4	2	20	
3	0	0	20
2	0	0	
1	1	10	
Total	10	100%	

H. Visitations by Center Staff to School District Teachers (11 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	3	27.2	
4	3	27.2	
3	4	36.4	63.6
2	1	9.2	
1	0	0	
Total	11	100%	

I. Visitations by School District Staff to the Center (10 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	2	20	
4	2	20	
3	2	20	40
2	1	10	
1	3	30	
Total	10	100%	

J. Conference Between Parents and Center Teachers (10 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	7	70	
4	1	10	
3	0	0	10
2	1	10	
1	1	10	
Total	10	100%	

IV. ITEM ANALYSIS OF CATEGORIES UNDER RELATED SERVICES

M. Conferences Sponsored by the Learning Center (14 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	0	0	
4	9	64.3	
3	2	14.3	78.6
2	2	14.3	
1	1	7.1	
Total	14	100%	

N. Communications Between the Center and the School Districts (13 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	1	7.7	
4	8	61.5	
3	3	23.1	84.6
2	0	0	
1	1	7.7	
Total	13	100%	

O. Professional Consultations by Staff Members of the Center (13 districts)

Rating	Frequency	% of Total	% of Favorable Responses
5	3	23.1	
4	3	23.1	
3	4	30.8	53.9
2	2	15.4	
1	1	7.6	
Total	13	100%	

V. DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN SERVICES OF THE CENTER (14 districts)

a. Recommendations for services which should receive increased emphasis.

Category[1]	Frequency	% of Total Recommendations
A	2	7.7
B	3	11.5
C	1	3.8
D	2	7.7
E	1	3.8
F	3	11.5
G	2	7.7
H	1	3.8
I	4	15.4
J	1	3.8
M	2	7.7
N	1	3.8
O	1	3.8
No Change	2	7.7
Total	26	99.7[2]

1. Letters refer to categories on Page 1 of evaluation form.
2. Less than 100% due to rounding.

b. Recommendations for services which should receive decreased emphasis.

Category	Frequency	% of Total Recommendations
D	1	7.7
F	1	7.7
No Changes	11	84.6
Total	13	100%

c. Recommendations for services which are not included, which should be offered.

No Change - 9
Related Comments - 5

VI. SUMMARY OF DISTRICT EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM OF THE LEARNING CENTER (14 districts)

In the opinion of the cooperating school district . . . . .

a. do the activities of the Learning Center satisfy the objectives specified in the original funding proposal?

Response	Frequency	% of Total
Yes	8	57.2
No	3	21.4
Undecided	3	21.4
Total	14	100%

b. should the program of the Learning Center during the next academic year continue substantially the same as during the present academic year?

Response	Frequency	% of Total
Yes	11	78.6
No	3	21.4
Undecided	0	0
Total	14	100%

c. should the Learning Center attempt to continue operations after the period of federal funding (through June, 1969)?

Response	Frequency	% of Total
Yes	10	71.5
No	0	0
Undecided	4	28.5
Total	14	100%

d. should regions similar to the Broome-Tioga county area attempt to initiate learning centers?

Response	Frequency	% of Total
Yes	7	50.0
No	1	7.2
Undecided	6	42.8
Total	14	100%

e. is the Learning Center a meaningful way to spend federal money specifically earmarked for handicapped children (recent changes in the Title III act provide that not less than 15% of available funds must go to programs for the handicapped)?

Response	Frequency	% of Total
Yes	12	85.7
No	0	0
Undecided	2	14.3
Total	14	100%

VII. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE RESPONSES BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS REFLECT A CONSENSUS AMONG THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF (14 districts)

Degree of Consensus	Frequency	% of Total
Some	3	21.4
Moderate	3	21.4
Considerable	8	57.2
Total	14	100%

VIII. COMMENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS (Adapted)

A. Part II of Evaluation Form

Indicate those services which should receive increased emphasis during the 1968-69 school year.

1. . . results of communications between parents and Center teachers should be made known to the classroom teacher (noted by two districts).

2. . . more clinical approach for selected cases.

3. . . increased psychological services.

4. . . include near point vision and hearing evaluations.

5. . . complete medical, psychiatric, and related evaluations should be offered routinely to each pupil.

6. . . specific suggestions for helping the pupil should be provided for the classroom teacher.

7. . . better coordination of Center-School District efforts.

Indicate services which are not included in the above list and which should be offered by the Learning Center during the 1968-69 school year.

1. . . provide follow-up studies of pupils enrolled in the instructional program.

2. . . enroll pupils who have difficulty in arithmetic.

3. . . have a mobile diagnostic team to do testing in each of the cooperating school districts.

4. . . consult with reading personnel in each district before the instructional activities are begun at the Center.

5. . . invite classroom teachers to observe pupils in the instructional program at the Center.

B. Part III of Evaluation Form

In the opinion of the cooperating school district

. . . a. do the activities of the Learning Center satisfy the objectives specified in the original funding proposal?

1. . . original intent was to expand the services of the Center to other subject areas.

2. . . (Yes), except for research and establishment of county norms, and services to provide school districts with the means to investigate their own programs.

. . . b. should the program of the Learning Center during the next academic year continue substantially the same as during the present academic year?

1. . . school district finds it difficult to participate in the tutorial program.

2. . . instruction should be offered more than twice a week; if this can't be accommodated, then the pupils should be seen on two successive days.

3. . . too much time spent in transportation for the number of minutes of actual instruction.

4. . . place more emphasis on the "trainee" program.

5. . . retain pupils beyond the point at which they are minimally able to be accommodated within the regular classroom setting.

. . . c. should the Learning Center attempt to continue operations after the period of Federal funding (through June, 1969)?

1. . . should become a BOCES operation.

2. . . fills a definite need for pupils in Southern Tier schools.

3. . . should continue, if financial considerations and related matters permit (noted by three districts).

. . . d. should regions similar to the Broome-Tioga county area attempt to initiate learning centers?

1. . . would be dependent upon local circumstances.

2. . . if financial consideration and other related matters permit.

3. . . since the area served is so large, the number of potential students far exceeds the number actually being accommodated. Greater emphasis should be placed upon the "hard core" pupils in each district and upon the other areas noted in original proposal.

C. Part IV of Evaluation Form

Please make additional comments in this space.

1. . . more personal contacts needed between the cooperating school districts and the Center (noted by two districts).

2. . . director's consultations with central administrative staff regarding reading problems were well received.

3. . . program has been beneficial to children of "borderline" intelligence.

4. . . classroom teacher concerned about the loss of instructional time as a result of transportation factor.

5. . . would be helpful if Center personnel spent one to two weeks in September at the school district for diagnostic workups.

6. . . project a start toward educating supervising personnel about individualized instruction.

7. . . activities of the Center could be carried on by the individual school districts at a more economical cost.

8. . . conferences sponsored by the Center should be made available to all district personnel.

9. . . complete medical and related evaluations should be routinely offered to pupils.

APPENDIX III

School District Population Survey

Participation Status
1967-68 School Year

LEARNING DISABILITY CENTER
58 Oak Street
Binghamton, New York 13905

SCHOOL DISTRICT POPULATION SURVEY
1967 - 1968

PUBLIC

District	Enrollment 1-6	Enrollment 7-12		Total
Binghamton	6,500	5,500		12,000
Chenango Forks	1,400	850		2,250
Chenango Valley	1,900	1,800		3,700
Deposit	787	514		1,301
Harpursville	650	460		1,110
Johnson City	2,506	1,865		4,371
Maine-Endwell	2,495	2,118		4,613
Newark Valley	974	795		1,769
Owego- Apalachin	2,345	1,723		4,068
Susquehanna Valley	1,691	1,248		2,939
Tioga Center	650	469		1,119
Union-Endicott	3,669	2,758		6,427
Vestal	3,926	3,334		7,260
Whitney Point	1,140	810		1,950
Windsor	1,650	1,075		2,725
	32,283	25,319	total	57,602

PRIVATE

Catholic Parochial	5,237	1,407		6,644
Hillel	23			23
Ross Corners Baptist	134			134
Seventh Day Adventists	19	8		27
	5,413	1,415	total	6,828
			Grand Total	64,430

LEARNING CENTER
58 Oak Street
Binghamton, New York 13905

PARTICIPATION STATUS
1967-68 School Year

	No. of School Districts	Pupil Population	% of Total Eligible Population
A. Total Eligible Population:	15 Public	57,602	87.3
	4 Private	6,828	12.7
	19 Total	64,430	100.0%
B. Participating Population (Instructional Program):	10 Public	47,395	72.1
	1 Private	6,644	11.9
	11 Total	54,039	84.0%
C. Participating Population (Diagnostic Eval. Only):	3 Public	7,319	11.0
	0 Private	0	0
	3 Total	7,319	11.0%
D. Combined Participating Population (Instructional & Diagnostic Services):	13 Public	54,714	84.2
	1 Private	6,644	10.8
	14 Total	61,358	95.0%

APPENDIX IV

Part II

Application to Establish, Operate and Maintain

a Supplementary Educational Center

LEARNING DISABILITY CENTER
58 Oak Street
Binghamton, New York 13905

OPERATIONAL

PART II

APPLICATION TO ESTABLISH, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN
A SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTER

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW

A. At the present time the participating School Districts are offering a program of reading consistent with the American philosophy of education, which is based on educating every child to his capacity. As much as possible children are being taught in a sequential program, commencing in the kindergarten with a readiness program, and continuing through the elementary grades generally with a basal reader being provided, and emphasis on phonics and configuration. However, there seems to be a great need for increased individual attention for we all have children who do not respond to our programs in the public or private school setting in a way most beneficial to them.

The loss of potential manpower, the high dropout rate from our schools, the cost of unemployment, delinquency, and crime, the threat to sound family relationships and to individuals within families, all are direct or indirect consequences which can be traced, at least partly to the fact that education has largely ignored the reading needs of a certain segment of our school population.

In order to establish feasibility, a survey was made of the nineteen participating School Districts to determine whether or not a Reading Center would be feasible for our area. The results of this study are included further in the proposal.

It is the proposal that the participating School Districts to establish a LEARNING DISABILITY CENTER geographically and centrally located whereby that small percentage of our children who do not respond to the normal classroom situation might receive the kinds of assistance necessary to help them to become cooperating, participating citizens of a democratic society. We visualize this Center to be one that would:

1. Provide special help for children in the areas of reading, psychological services, and in the development of other subject skills. What is being proposed is Phase I of such a project; Phase I being a Reading Clinic to provide diagnostic services, therapy for dyslexic children, investigative services for all participating School Districts, consulting services for all participating schools and an area that would conduct local research and establish local norms, a resource center, a location in the county where every piece of new material may be on file and available for teachers including the latest in teaching machines, books, kits, programmed instruction, et al.

A countywide training clinic which will provide in-service education for teachers of participating School Districts, and in general an area where teachers and administrators can go for extra help with the severe learning problems faced by the children in their School District.

If a Federal grant is forthcoming, we shall immediately and co-operatively select a Director for the Reading Center who in turn will establish a cadre of reading teachers. We shall secure ten available classrooms at St. Patrick's School in Binghamton, New York, so that we might become operational at the same time that we continue our planning for additional services for our children.

SECTION 2: <u>A, B, D, D, E PROJECT PROPOSAL</u>

It is the intent of the participating School Districts to establish a Supplementary Educational Center to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed reading services which are not available in sufficient quantity or quality at the present time; and to stimulate and assist in the establishment of an exemplary Elementary School Reading Program to serve as a model for regular school programs throughout the county for all children who do not respond to the normal classroom situation. Our Center will be called a LEARNING DISABILITY CENTER.

We are proposing as Phase I a Reading Clinic.

The Reading Clinic will serve approximately 1½% to 3½% of the student population of Broome County and parts of Tioga County. It will provide the participating School Districts with the following services:

1. Diagnostic services whereby children and their reading skills may be completely analyzed by every known means to determine the nature of their reading problems.

2. Investigative services to provide School Districts with means to investigate their own programs.

3. An opportunity for the application of skills to provide youngsters the opportunity of applying skills in a structured situation.

4. Treatment - a Center will be developed to treat only those children with perceptive problems who do not respond to the ordinary classroom situation.

5. Consulting services to provide all participating School Districts with a program of consulting services including in-service training for teachers, workshop and county institutes, demonstration teaching, and surveys.

6. To conduct specific research involving children from this area of the country, and to develop county reading norms.

7. To serve as a resource center, a place where every piece of new material may be on file and available for teachers; the latest in teaching machines, books, kits, programmed instruction, etc.

8. To establish guidelines for a preventative reading program in all participating schools. Here programs for potential dropouts may be developed, programs to increase reading skills, and programs for screening out dyslexic children early in their school years.

9. A place for training. A countywide clinic can and will provide training for local teachers. Teachers from each School District will be sent to the clinic for one semester, or one year, to be returned to the School District as qualified and trained reading specialists to share their services with other teachers and the children of their schools.